



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/943,599	08/30/2001	Gary L. Swoboda	TI-30481	TI-30481 2479	
23494	7590 01/04/2006		EXAMINER		
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999			SAXENA, AKASH		
DALLAS, TX 75265			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2128		

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/943,599	SWOBODA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Akash Saxena	2128		

·	Akash Saxena	2128					
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.   The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date		to decomposition to alternative of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 79 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	• •	36(a) and the annronria	te extension fee				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	dianas with 27 CED 44 27 must be	filed within the ment	a af the data of				
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
AMENDMENTS	huis nation so shou does not filling a buint	will not be entered by					
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> </ol>							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the</li> </ul>							
non-allowable claim(s).		•	_				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an 6	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,4,5,13,15,16,23,24,27-30. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)					
<del>-</del>							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: No amendments were made to the claims. Applicant has argued against the prior art to go around the prior art, however the claims as recited do not contain the elements as argued. For example, on Pg.10 applicant argues, "There is no teaching in Mann that a full count in the synchronization register TSYNCH causes generation of a new segment address." (Examiner disagrees - See comments below for remarks on Pg.9). The limitation relating to "full count in the TSYNCH register" is not recited in the claim 1 rejection.

Another example of the limitation argued but not claimed is on Pg. 10 where the applicant argues: "Further there is no teaching in Mann that the address provided by the entries in Table 6 (Mann) are specified as an offset to a synchronization marker as recited in claim 1". There is no recitation in claim 1 that the synchronization marker is providing any address and more so if this address is any different from the base address or program counter address as disclosed by Mann. Also see Mann as cited in remarks on Pg.9 where all the TCOED entries are synchronizing events providing base address/program counter address.

Applicant argues on page 8 that "a change in segment base address is communicated as part of the trace stream" and on page 9 "Mann teaches that the trace address values are offset from the prior and still unchanged segment base address". The two arguments argument seems contrary to each other as it unclear from applicant's argument if the argument is being made for or against the change in the segment base address. However, Mann clearly teaches updaing the base address.

Further, as recited from Mann on Pg.9 of the remarks, "all TCODEs except TCODE=1 are synchronizing events providing address information. Thus, in the described embodiment each trace entry having TCODE not equal to 1 causes a counter to be loaded to a value in the TSYNCH register which allows the counter to count the desired number of trace records generated before current program address is provided." Hence the (base) address information is continueosly updated whenever synchronization is performed.

The claims as recited do not teach over prior art, however examiner would be in favor of examining amended claims which clearly read over and overcome the teachings of the prior art cited.

KAMINI SHAH SUPERVISORY PATENT E XAMINER